

The Senate of Michigan Technological University
Minutes of Special Meeting No. 1 (1992-93)

I. Call to Order

At 7:09 pm on Wednesday, 21 April 1993, President Sharik called the meeting to order in Room 113, Metallurgy & Materials Science Building.

II. Roll Call of Regular Members

22 Senators or alternates were present. Senators or alternates from the following units were absent: AF ROTC, Army ROTC, Chemical Engineering, Computer Sciences, Humanities, IMP, KRC, Physical Education, Graduate Student Council, Undergraduate Student Govt. Absent Senator-at-large: Vable. Chem Eng was represented by Tomas Co, and Humanities by Eric Freedman. Provost Dobney was present.

III. Recognition of Visitors

J. Coleman-Plouff (Senate Assistant), S. Chalmers (Sch of Tech), T. Collins (Sch of Tech), J. Glime (Bio Sciences), J. Gorm (Sch of Tech), K. Harder (Sch of Tech), M. Kilpela (Sch of Tech), J. Jamar (Sch of Tech), M. Janners (Dean of Students), P. Johnson (Van Pelt Library), K. Lipmann (MTU Lode), W. McGarry (Treas & CFO), B. Nelson (Sch of Tech), M. Schroeder (Sch of Tech), P. Tampas (Sch of Tech), W. Weingarten (Sch of Tech).

IV. Agenda Adjustments

Sharik referred to the Agenda (Appendix A of these minutes), and said that Provost Dobney and Chief Financial Officer McGarry would make a presentation on the budget before the Senate proceeded with other business. Under New Business, Elections Committee Chair Heyman would make an announcement concerning elections. Institutional Analysis Committee Chair Hubbard announced that proposals from his committee had been prepared.

V. Message from the Provost

Provost Dobney presented an overview of the University's budget, emphasizing that it was still in draft form. The operating budget goals include (1) building a reserve in case the State did not make a payment, (2) improving salaries, (3) reducing dependence on tuition, and (4) preparing for new faculty positions.

Dobney presented the latest version of the budget, based on his discussions with members of the Board of Control. The position of the Board on tuition increase is not clear; the last figure was 9 percent. The budget was based on a 7 percent increase, with a 1 percent surcharge for students in the exceptional category from WI, IL, and MN. This 1 percent is in response to legislative pressure, and the revenue will be applied to financial aid for Michigan students. The administration is beginning to discuss differential tuition rates for juniors, seniors and graduate students. Dobney said the average cost for grad students per year is \$24,000, while the average student (graduate and undergraduate) costs \$8800; MTU is the only institution known that charges the same tuition for undergraduate and graduate students. If the tuition increase is less than 7 percent, the loss in income will come out of the deficit reduction line item.

The retirement enhancement item at \$500,000, with \$600,000 next year, is to fund the reserve for the retirement medical benefits.

Currently the program is being funded from the operating budget. Mentioning the funds allocated for minority/gender improvements, Dobney said he has reconstituted the committee that devised the original program, and broadened its representation; he has asked it to adopt a more thoughtful and planful outlook, so the program is implemented in a way that does not reflect unfavorably on women and minorities hired through the normal process. Dobney emphasized that the budget has been altered as a result of the presentations of the initial drafts. More money has been put into program development and into library computerization. He said that MTU is actually in pretty good financial shape, comparatively; schools in many states are facing large financial cuts. MTU also has fewer administrative personnel than many state universities, because Michigan has less onerous reporting laws.

Heyman suggested that future budget presentations might include more detail, both in the meaning of headings, and in breaking down the larger sums. McGarry said the numbers might be gathered. Jambekar wondered whether the Board of Control would allow such presentations. Dobney said he thought they would, and that he had discussed this with President Tompkins. He also had talked with Tompkins about the Senate's revision of its constitution; both were prepared to support it, with the exception of the "blank check" provision, number 14. Dobney suggested a rewording of the provision. Sharik said that this would be discussed. Dobney said that he thought the Board would ultimately follow the recommendations of the Provost and President.

Grimm asked about provisions in the budget for physical plant maintenance. Dobney said that the budget had a line for deferred maintenance, and that Physical Plant should be approached about specific items.

Dobney said that McGarry had done well in budget investigation and preparation, given the available resources; University budgeting essentially had been done by one person prior to McGarry's arrival. The personnel to do budgetary analyses do not exist.

Dobney said that auxiliary enterprises would contribute significantly to the budget; previously it had been budgeted separately. Dobney added that there are on campus about 300 full-time employees earning less than \$20,000/year. This is a problem: 95% of these are women, many sole support of households. Vilmann asked about the projected increase in the auxiliary enterprises income. McGarry replied that it was in the 4.7-6 percent range. Hubbard said that information about

Page 3883 Minutes of Senate Spec Mtng #1 (92-3) 21 Apr 1993

the base amount could be obtained from departments for next years budgeting process. Dobney agreed it could be done, but that McGarry's office might need some additional support. Sharik said that the spirit in creating the Senate's Financial Planning & Policy Committee was to put in place a mechanism for providing input to the budgeting process. Dobney said that additional evidence of cooperation was his own commitment to provide release time of one course per quarter for the Senate President next year.

Heuvers asked if Dobney were planning to stay for discussion of the constitutional revision. Dobney agreed if it were to be considered next. Sharik asked if there were any objection to altering the agenda. There was none.

VI. Old Business § Constitutional Revision

Sharik reminded the Senate that it was in the middle of the amendment procedure which required a second Senate approval of the

draft constitution and bylaws. Sharik noted that the revisions made before the vote in the previous meeting had been incorporated in a fourth draft distributed to the Senate. This fourth draft was accompanied by a listing of the changes to the third draft, and by a memo describing a wording problem (Appendix B of these minutes). He also said that a memo had been sent to the administration and to the Board of Control giving the rationale for the revisions (Appendix C of these minutes). Sharik called for a motion to adopt the revised constitution. Roblee moved that Draft 4 be accepted as an amendment to the current constitution. Carstens seconded the motion.

Heuvers proposed (Appendix D of these minutes) to replace the two statements of general senatorial authority, item III-F-1-a-13 and item III-F-3-a-4, with a single statement following Section III-F. Heuvers said the reason was editorial, because a disclaimer should precede the list. Heuvers moved that his change be adopted. Roblee seconded the motion. The motion passed without opposition with a show-of-hands vote.

Heuvers invited Provost Dobney to comment on the item. Dobney said he did not want to tell the Senate what to put into the revision. He said that when he made his recommendation to the Board, it would be that they not approve this provision. Hubbard asked what wording would be acceptable. Dobney said that the problem is the blank-check nature of the statement -- "We've listed all the things we can think of right now that we're going to establish policy on, but if we think there's something else, we'll establish policy on that too." Dobney said that was not reasonable, and that no reasonable group of people would accept that latitude in authority. Dobney suggested a rewording of the statement that would allow the Senate to approach the Board to add new items to the list. Dobney said that once the Board has accepted the list, it would not be difficult to approach them for additional items. Heuvers moved to make an editorial change, adding the phrase "subject to the approval by the Board of Control". The motion was seconded.

Roblee said this addition would severely limit the senate, and would require the Board to approve senate policy if it were not in the list of items. He said it would result in the senate going to the Board more frequently than either the Board or senate might wish. Dobney said that this does not pertain to the internal operating procedures of the senate. Heuvers asked whether the phrasing "in the Bylaws" was appropriate. Heyman said that the reason for the bylaws phrase was to permit a quicker response than amending the constitution. Grimm said an advantage to this procedure is that it permits establishment of a working relationship between the senate and the Board. Heuvers said that the listing in the draft of areas of authority was derived from the constitution of the Senate at the University of Vermont.

Keen said that this addition, if adopted, would represent a significant change in the proposed constitution and that the amendment process would have to be restarted. Heuvers asked the chair to rule whether the addition constituted an editorial change or an amendment. Sharik asked for a vote to determine whether this was an editorial change. A show-of-hands vote favored a determination as an editorial change, 16-1. A show of hands vote to adopt the change passed, 21-0.

Keen referred to the memo (Appendix B of these minutes) from the Senate Council that accompanied the fourth draft, and moved that "It is the sense of the Senate that senators-at-large are to vote as if they were representatives of academic degree-granting departments." Boutilier seconded the motion. Keen said that if the motion passes, Draft 4 would need to be rewritten in several places, requiring the two-vote cycle of Senate approval to be restarted; if it fails, the effect is to rescind the "Hubbard amendment". Hubbard said he had made what he thought was a simple

amendment, that at-large senators should be elected at-large, with the understanding that they would vote on everything. This would give persons who are not members of the various subdivisions voice in all senate matters. Sharik asked if this included academic matters. Hubbard said it did; the senators-at-large would vote on everything regardless of which subgroup they originated from. Heuvers said that every constituent of the senate would belong to some sub-group, and cited section II-B of the fourth draft.

Heuvers said that senators-at-large might be considered representatives of degree-granting departments if subsection III-E-1 were altered by deleting "senators-at-large". Sharik said that the current structure of the document is confusing because senators-at-large are mentioned on page 2, and are not defined until page 5. Hubbard said that Heuvers' proposed deletion was not in accord with the intent of his original amendment. Hubbard suggested that perhaps the Senate had not understood that senators-at-large were to vote on all matters when it voted to approve his amendment. Bornhorst said that he had seconded the amendment with an interpretation like Hubbard's. Keen said that senators-at-large might not be academic faculty and might be derived from non-academic units; if they are to vote on academic matters, the constitution is internally inconsistent because it limits voting on academic matters to representatives of the academic faculty. Hubbard said that senators-at-large would be elected by the academic faculty. Keen said they in fact would be elected at-large under the Hubbard amendment, but that the proposed constitution required academic matters to be the jurisdiction only of the academic faculty. He added that if Hubbard's amendment were to be incorporated as intended, several sections of the proposed constitution would have to be rewritten. Keen said internal consistency was important, because the proposed constitution would be examined closely by lawyers hired by the Board of Control. Roblee said that the problem might not be as large as Hubbard perceived it, because senators-at-large always had been faculty. Given this, they will be able to vote on academic issues. Grimm said this was another example of the difficulties with a constitution having separate-but-not-equal groups.

Page 3884 Minutes of Senate Spec Mtng #1 (92-3) 21 Apr 1993

Bornhorst asked whether the original wording allowed senators-at-large to vote on research matters. Heyman said that it did. Heyman said he understood the logic of Keen's motion, that if senators-at-large were to vote on everything, a series of changes would have to be made in the draft. Heyman asked for Keen's opinion-- would he rather have the motion voted down so that senators-at-large would be elected from the academic faculty, or have the motion approved so that the constitution could be changed to embody Hubbard's intention. Keen said the point of the motion was to show that Hubbard's amendment was not a simple change, and that the document would need further work to be clarified.

Vilmann said that the changes suggested by the memo would be clear, that senators-at-large from academic units would vote as academic faculty and senators-at-large not from academic units would not vote as academic faculty. Keen asked if this meant that they were to vote as academic faculty. Vilmann said only if they were from academic units. Keen said this would require an extensive rewrite. Heuvers said it would not. Hubbard said that the rewording suggested in the memo would be an acceptable compromise, and would be only an editorial change. Vilmann said that Keen's motion was essentially the original intent of Hubbard's

amendment. The motion failed 3-17, in a show-of-hands vote.

Heuvers moved that an editorial change be made in subsections III-E-1 and III-E-2, removing "senators-at-large". Vilmann seconded the motion. Roblee asked if the editorial change accomplished what Hubbard had intended. Hubbard said it did not, that his original intent was that senators-at-large should vote on everything regardless of their origin. Heuvers said that the constitution could always be amended later. Moore asked for a clarification: because senators-at-large not from academic departments do not vote on academic matters, will senators-at-large from academic departments also not vote on academic matters? Sharik said that this was not correct, that the intent was that only senators-at-large from academic departments would vote on academic matters. Moore said that senators-at-large were not representing academic departments. Grzelak said that the senators-at-large from academic departments could vote their consciences because they were not representing any department. Grzelak suggested that the subsections being considered have added the words "senators-at-large from academic departments" for clarity. Bornhorst said the meaning was clear without this. Heyman said that a commentary to accompany the constitution would make the point clear. Bulleit said the implication of the change suggested by Heuvers was that senators-at-large are not senators; the wording should insure that if you are a senator, a senator-at-large, and are from a degree-granting department, then you should vote on academic issues. Sharik said that the editorial change is appropriate, because it removes mention of senators-at-large before they are defined. The motion for the editorial change passed in a show-of-hands vote, 19-2.

Keen said that the meaning of Article VIII should be clarified for the record, and asked who were the constituents of the senators-at-large. The group consensus was that senators-at-large represent the entire constituency. Keen said that non-academic constituents could then submit ballot initiatives on academic issues. Heyman said that this was appropriate. After further discussion of several alternative wordings, the consensus of the Senate was to leave Article VIII as written. Heyman said that as it stands the article indicates that, if senators-at-large from academic departments vote on an academic issue, only the academic constituents of the senators-at-large may initiate a referendum. Sharik said that this should be on the record as an interpretation.

Roblee's motion that the proposed constitution be adopted as an amendment was passed with a roll-call vote, 20-1 with one abstention. Sharik called a 5-minute recess in the meeting.

VII. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of Meeting 196, held on 13 March 1993, were accepted and corrected. Grzelak moved that the minutes be approved as corrected; Heyman seconded the motion. The motion was approved without opposition.

VIII. Old Business § 4-year Program from the School of Technology

Sharik called for consideration of the proposal for a 4-year program for the School of Technology, which had been distributed to the Senate at the previous meeting. Carstens moved that the Senate approve the proposal. Grimm seconded the motion.

Heuvers said that a letter of agreement had been sent to Professor Baartmans, Head of Math Sciences, concerning at least the content of math courses in this curriculum. Sharik asked if the letter agrees to an accommodation of the proposed program. Roblee said that the letter involved a difference in the philosophy of teaching the math courses, and that the proposed math requirements for students in the School of Technology were those that are standard across the country for the proposed curriculum. Roblee said the discussion with the Math Department involved

housing of the courses in that department, taught to meet the needs of students in technology.

Roblee said that rumors about the cost of the program were based on a single scenario taken out of context from a planning committee report. A limit of 50 students assures that no new resources would be required. Bornhorst said it would be valuable for the Senate to hear the views of the School of Technology about the future of the 2-year degree program in light of the initiation of the 4-year program; will the 2-year program continue or be replaced by the 4-year program? Roblee said that 2-year programs vary among institutions; a two-plus-two program is frequently found, in which a student may plan to complete a two-year degree, and then stays to complete the four-year program.

Julien said that the program should in fact make money for the university, to the benefit of those programs supporting graduate students. Perger said that some departments are actively reducing the number of students, because they have too many students for the available faculty now. He suggested allowing these departments to maintain or increase numbers, which would accomplish the same financial goal as introducing the 4-year program. Bulleit said that his department is concerned about the match between the new program and the university's goals. There is additional concern about the teaching overload that the school is undertaking. It is clear that in the future the school will ask for resources to relieve the overload, and the concern is whether the 4-year program will be the appropriate place to put the resources. Roblee said that if the program is

Page 3885 Minutes of Senate Spec Mtng #1 (92-3) 21 Apr 1993

allowed to grow beyond 50 students, the cost margin will increase. Heyman said that this is the purpose of the marginal analysis.

Janners said the program should be viewed from the students' viewpoint; it should be looked at as a redistribution of students. Many students do not belong in the traditional engineering departments, and would be more successful in a technology program. Carstens replied to Bulleit's question about the future of the program, saying that the program does plan to expand in the future, and that nobody had better stand in the way of that expansion. Sharik asked whether Carstens was fundamentally against downsizing. Carstens said he was. Roblee said that most of the time in the Curriculum Committee had been spent with problems of resources and of the university's image, and that little time had been spent with concern about the students and their welfare. He said that it is better to have the students transfer among programs at MTU than go elsewhere, that most of the students graduating from the 2-year program did not enter that program, and that student retention would be increased further with the 4-year program. Grzelak said that his department has been downsizing student numbers for some time. Bornhorst said that the program would be clearly good for students, and would move the school into the university community. The principal issue seems to be the nature and future of the university; what should be its direction, a graduate or an undergraduate institution? Grimm said that good undergraduate engineering schools were rare, and that the technology program could and should support engineering graduate programs effectively. Roblee said that the fundamental nature of undergraduate training differs if students are being prepared for graduate school. MTU has had the reputation of training hand-on engineers and this distinction should not be lost. He added that the State of Michigan has far more openings for certified engineering

technicians than are trained in the state.

Perger said the proposal had the design sequence in the senior year, and wondered about the breadth of the program. Roblee said the breadth comes in the second two years, with much of the technical training in the first two years. Grzelak said that his department held a meeting in which this proposal was the sole topic, and a major concern was the confusion in the proposal over the distinction between an engineer and an engineering technologist. Two other concerns were image and competition for resources. Bulleit said his department had held a similar meeting in which similar issues were discussed, and the faculty had strong feelings in both directions. Jambekar said his constituents had similar feelings. There may well be a demand for persons with this training, but is it what Michigan Tech should be doing.

Roblee said that the departments that feel threatened by engineering technology should not feel this way, that they should grow if they are successful. The graduates of Michigan Tech's 2-year program do well on certification tests. Julien said that the program would add diversity to the university, that it is not like setting up a new program, and that it builds on what we already have. Carstens said that a good model of the 4-year program was that at Purdue.

Sharik asked for a clarification of the authorship of the proposal, because the source of the proposal was not indicated on the cover page nor in the document. Bornhorst said the Senate committee did not write the proposal; it was written by the School of Technology with input from the Senate Curriculum Committee. Sharik asked if that could be indicated on the document. Bornhorst said that this was not a Senate proposal, but would be forwarded as a proposal approved by the Senate. Julien said that as an activity for the new Senate, the proposals should come from the Senate, regardless of their origin. Roblee said that a new cover page could be prepared to reflect the origin of the proposal and the input of the Senate. A student from the School of Technology commented on the need for the proposal from the undergraduate viewpoint.

Bulleit said his personal view of the proposal had changed as a result of his work on the Senate committee, but that he was not firmly in favor of the proposal. He added that arguments based on university direction are strong ones, and that the Senate's decision about this proposal will be important in setting university direction. Bornhorst said that the arguments on university direction had been discussed for hours in the committee. The fundamental decision is what the university wants to be. Sharik stated that the minority report seemed to be based on the value of the program to the university. Bornhorst said that the minority memo was concerned with resource allocation, based on what direction the Michigan Tech wanted to go.

Janners said that the decision should include a consideration of the educational development of students, and that many students need such a program. Hubbard reported that the Chemical Engineering department does not favor the proposal. He referred to the April 15 memo from Collins (Appendix E of these minutes) and said there was no documentation for the figure of \$600,000 given in the memo. Hubbard said the proposal was unimaginative and does not explain how the engineering and the technology groups will work together. The proposal simply says that other universities have such a program and we want one too, which is not a compelling reason for accepting the program. Grimm said that the arrangements will have to be worked out after the program is in place; it is too much to expect this to be done ahead of time. He said that students in the technology programs with smaller classes have a better experience than students in engineering programs, and that the education they receive there is no barrier to graduate study. Heyman said that neither the budget of the university nor the

graduate program could grow without significantly increasing undergraduate enrollment. He added that the concern over university direction is one of status, and that the general perception is that schools with such programs are low in status, and that high status schools do not have such programs. He said that talking about status is more honest than talking about the philosophy of the school. Co said that Grimm's arguments actually favored the existing 2-year program, not the 4-year proposal. Boutilier said that the students need the program, and that the battles over turf being conducted by intelligent people are amazing to her. Lukowski said that the Michigan Tech needs to do what's right for Michigan and for the student. The number of jobs open to individuals with high school education is decreasing; there is an increasing number of openings for individuals with more than a high school education, but less than the rigorous mathematical and theoretical training provided by the typical BS degree in engineering. Lukowski stated that the 4-year program provides a basis for technological short-courses to update individuals in various fields as a part of the university's programs in technology transfer. Tampas stated that the programs in engineering and in technology are really complementary, that students may benefit by moving between the programs. He said that retention of students may be increased by the 4-year program. Vilmann said that many

Page 3886 Minutes of Senate Spec Mtng #1 (92-3) 21 Apr 1993

of the points made in the preceding discussion by representatives of the School of Technology should have been documented in the proposal itself; the proposal left too many unanswered questions. Roblee said that the proposal had been prepared for the Board of Control and the state administration, rather than the faculty. Keen said that the documentation in the committee's minority report suffered from arithmetical imprecision. Julien said the issue was simple, that if this sort of diversity is needed and if the undergraduates are important, then the vote should favor the program; otherwise, if the graduate program is favored over the undergraduate, the vote should be negative. Perger said he took exception to the notion that a negative vote indicated a lack of concern for the undergraduate program. Two students from the School of Technology spoke in favor of the program.

Heuvers asked for a roll-call vote for the approval of the proposal for a 4-year program in the School of Technology. The motion passed, 14-7, with 2 abstentions.

Sharik thanked the Curricular Policy Committee for its work on the proposal.

IX. Announcements

- A. Videotaping of Senate Meetings: Sharik said that the Provost had raised the issue of videotaping and rebroadcasting Senate meetings. Sharik said that the necessary equipment would be ready in the fall quarter, and the cost would be born by the Provost's office. Sharik asked for comments. Grimm said that the prospect was a good one if the Senate is to become more active, and that it will increase Senate accountability. He added that the regular monthly meetings are not adequate, and more frequent meetings are needed. There was further general discussion about the channel for broadcasting, opportunities to see fist-fights, broadcasting versus cable-casting, and the possibility of videotaping meetings of the Board of Control.
- B. Heyman distributed an informative memo (Appendix F of these minutes) naming the persons nominated for Senate election to

the University Committee on Sabbatical Leave, The University Athletic Council, and the University General Education Committee. He announced that the Senate would vote on these nominees at the next meeting.

- C. Sharik urged the Senators to return to their constituencies to explain and support the new constitution. Vilmann asked when would be distributed a revised document incorporating all the changes and revisions to the proposed constitution. Keen said that the new constitution would be distributed with Tech Topics, to save paper. The ballots would be distributed separately. Sharik said that the Constitution & Constituency Committee had drafted a document giving an overview of the revision process, to accompany the proposed constitution.
- D. Keen announced that the Institutional Evaluation Committee had recently forwarded documents on faculty governance, and that these would be included with the agenda for the next meeting.

X. Adjournment

Grimm moved that the meeting be adjourned. Bornhorst seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. Sharik declared the meeting adjourned at 10:05 pm.

Submitted by Robert Keen
Senate Secretary

.